DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 410 033 PS 025 699

AUTHOR Minami, Masahiko
TITLE Development of Japanese Children's Narrative Skills: Linguistic Devices and Strategies To Encode Their Perspective and Emotion.
PUB DATE Apr 97
NOTE 38p.; Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development (62nd, Washington, DC, April 3-6, 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Child Development; *Child Language; Foreign Countries; Interpersonal Communication; *Language Acquisition; Narration; *Personal Narratives; Perspective Taking; *Preschool Children; Preschool Education; Verbal Communication
IDENTIFIERS *Emotional Expression; Emotions; Japanese People; Japanese Speaking; Linguistic Codes; *Linguistic Form

ABSTRACT

Studies on child language acquisition suggest that Japanese children begin to use a variety of linguistic signs very early. However, even if young Japanese children learned the social pragmatic functions and interactional dimensions of such linguistic means and communicative devices, they might not have acquired the subtleties of those devices that is expected in telling oral personal narratives, such as the effective use of proper verb-ending forms to encode the narrator's perspective. A total of 20 middle-class Japanese preschool children participated in this study along with their mothers; their oral personal narratives were studied in order to analyze what kinds of linguistic means and rhetorical devices they deployed in narrative. The findings seemed to indicate that cognitive, linguistic, conversational, and social-interactional dimensions take different courses in the process of language acquisition, but that, at the same time, these factors interact in a complex fashion in narrative development. In telling personal narratives, preschoolers have not yet mastered certain linguistic devices and manipulative strategies so that they are capable of effectively encoding their perspectives as well as their emotions. Unlike talking about the here-and-now, in the development of narrative skills preschoolers have a long way to go. Telling a narrative on their own does not seem to be an easy task for young children. (Contains 29 references.) (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Running head: NARRATIVE SKILLS

ED 410 033

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Development of Japanese Children's Narrative Skills: Linguistic Devices and Strategies to Encode Their Perspective and Emotion

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Masahiko Minami
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Masahiko Minami

San Francisco State University

Author's Address: Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures
College of Humanities
San Francisco State University
1600 Holloway Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94132

PS 025699

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Studies on child language acquisition suggest that Japanese children begin to use a variety of linguistic signs very early. However, even if Japanese young children learned the social pragmatic functions or interactional dimensions of such linguistic means and communicative devices, they might not have acquired the subtleties of those devices expected in telling oral personal narratives, such as the effective use of proper verb-ending forms to encode the narrator's perspective. A total of twenty middle-class Japanese preschool children participated in this study, along with their mothers; their oral personal narratives were studied in order to analyze what kinds of linguistic means and rhetorical devices they deployed in narrative. The findings seem to indicate that cognitive, linguistic, conversational, and social-interactional dimensions take different courses in the process of language acquisition, but that, at the same time, these factors interact in a complex fashion in narrative development. In telling personal narratives, preschoolers have not yet mastered certain linguistic devices and manipulative strategies so that they are capable of effectively encoding their perspectives as well as their emotions. Unlike talking about the here-and-now, in the development of narrative skills preschoolers have a long way to go. Telling a narrative on their own does not seem to be an easy task for young children.

The Development of Japanese Children's Narrative Skills: Linguistic Devices and Strategies to Encode the Narrator's Perspective and Emotion

In this paper I examine the means by which Japanese children and adults encode their perspective and emotion. Personal narratives involve a description of a past experience. There have been studies examining narratives told by people in particular sociocultural settings. Among the authors of these studies are two scholars who particularly inspired me to write this paper: sociolinguist William Labov (1972) and Japanese linguist Senko Maynard (1993). While differing from each other in terms of focus, these two scholars share one important aspect. They both interpret narrative as a socioculturally situated activity.

A great number of narrative studies stem from Labov's 1972 work, in which he defined narrative as a recapitulation of chronologically sequenced events and he analyzed stories in terms of textual composition. Labov claimed that a narrative consists of two essential functions: referential and evaluative. According to Labov, one referential component is complicating actions--the sequence of specific, chronologically-ordered events comprising the experience. Another important referential component is orientation in which the narrator digresses from the events of a narrative so that he or she provides the listener with contextual embedding of the narrative, such as the setting, people,

time, features of environment, conditions, and ongoing behavior in the narrative. The evaluative function, on the other hand, informs the listener of the narrator's attitude toward the events of the narrative or the event's significance to the narrator. Therefore, a narrative not only retains the temporal ordering of a past event or experience, but it also evaluates a past event or experience, suggesting the point or significance of that event or experience, as far as the narrator is concerned.

These structural organizations of narrative were also discussed by Bruner (1986) in a slightly different way. According to Bruner, narrative is composed of two landscapes: the landscape of action is a canvas on which the narrator paints the world of action in the story, whereas the landscape of consciousness, on the other hand, describes "how the world is perceived or felt by various members of the cast of characters, each from their own perspective" (Feldman, Bruner, Renderer, & Spitzer 1990, p. 2). Developmentally, the child's acquisition of these two vehicles for thought and language production--the landscape of consciousness in particular--is crucial to understanding his or her progress in narrative production, because, according to Bruner (1986), it tells the listener about "what those involved in the action know, think, or feel, or do not know, think, or feel" (p. 14).

Returning to Labov, another type of categorization that he suggested was restricted narrative clauses and free

narrative clauses (Labov, 1972). Action clauses are categorized as restricted narrative clauses because they recapitulate a single event that took place at some discrete or restricted point in time. In other words, because restricted narrative clauses are temporally ordered, a change in their order will result in a change in the representation of the original semantic interpretation. In contrast, free narrative clauses, which include orientation and evaluation clauses, are not confined by any temporal juncture, and can therefore range freely through the narrative sequence.

A similar distinction, foreground information and background information, was suggested by Hopper (1979). Foreground information refers to the parts of the narrative that relate a sequence of events with respect to a timeline thus belonging to the skeletal structure[1] of the narrative. In other words, foreground information consists of plot-advancing events/main line event clauses. In contrast, background information includes plot-motivating comments and contextualizing clauses. More specifically, background information refers to supportive narrative (e.g., orientation, which presents static descriptions of the scene, and evaluation, which describes the agent's motives) that does not itself narrate the main events.

What is of particular interest here is that, in terms of narrative development, children's capability increases to generate and integrate a variety of linguistic components, such as syntactic, semantic, pragmatic, and lexical. These

components are also connected with children's growing cognitive competencies in one way or another. Previous research (Berman & Slobin, 1994; Minami, 1996; Reilly, 1992), for example, has revealed developmental changes in children's contributions to providing foreground information (i.e., restricted narrative clauses) and background information (i.e., free narrative clauses), as a function of increasing age. More specifically, there has been an interest in the relationship between the older an individual becomes and the more nonsequential information--evaluation in particular--he or she adds to the narrative, in order to emphasize why he or she wants to tell the narrative.

When turning our attention to studies on Japanese conversational discourse, we find that researchers such as LoCastro (1987), Maynard (1989, 1993), White (1989), and Yamada (1992) have described a variety of its characteristic features. Among them, Maynard's (1993) study is particularly relevant to the current topic because she identified certain Japanese linguistic devices and manipulative strategies that essentially convey a subjective emotion as well as an individual's shared feelings with others. Contrary to Westerners' stereotyped misconception of Japanese individuals as quiet, showing little emotion, Maynard emphasized that a variety of emotive signs--for example, discourse connectives, modal adverbs, verb forms, and interactional particles--are deployed in the Japanese language so that an individual can convey his or her emotion effectively to the listener.

As seen in the studies conducted by Maynard (1993) and others described above, research focusing on Japanese conversation already exists. Unfortunately, however, there is little work on young children's personal narratives. Studies on child language acquisition suggest that Japanese children begin to use a variety of linguistic signs very early, for example, "formal" des(u)/mas(u) verb-ending forms (i.e., suffixes) at about two years of age (e.g., Clancy, 1985). However, even if young children learned the social pragmatic functions or interactional dimensions of such linguistic means and communicative devices, they might not have acquired the subtleties of those devices expected in telling oral personal narratives, such as the effective use of proper verb-ending forms to encode the narrator's perspective. To fill a gap that currently exists in this body of research, therefore, this paper examines young Japanese children's personal narratives in two different contexts, monologic (i.e., telling a narrative alone) and dialogic (i.e., co-constructing a narrative with someone else).

Methods

Subjects

A total of twenty middle-class Japanese preschool children participated in this study, along with their mothers. Of these children, 10 were in five-year-old children's classrooms in preschool at the time of data collection, whereas the other 10 were in four-year-old

children's classrooms; in each of the subgroups, half of the children were males, half females so that any relationship between sex of the child and lexical development could be examined.[2] These children's oral personal narratives--both monologic (a child alone) and dialogic (a mother-child pair) --were studied in order to analyze what kinds of linguistic means and rhetorical devices they deploy in narrative. The reason that this study focused on preschoolers is due to age constraints that emerge from analysis of the development of children's narratives. Children begin telling personal narratives from the age of two (Sachs, 1979), but in any culture these early productions are quite short through the age of three and a half years (McCabe & Peterson, 1991). By about age four, however, children become able to produce fairly complex narratives (McCabe & Peterson, 1991; Peterson & McCabe, 1983; Ninio & Snow, 1996). Preschool years thus represent the period of extremely rapid development in the child's acquisition of narrative capacity.

Data Collection and Procedures

Monologic narrative production. Monologic narrative activity is based on Labov's (1972) methodology for eliciting personal narratives, specifically, danger-of-death or scary event narratives, a child version of which was later developed by Peterson and McCabe (1983) for analyzing children's developing narrative skill. Before eliciting narratives, rapport was established by an adult Japanese interviewer with the child, through activities such as

drawing pictures. When children were judged to be comfortable with the interviewer, they were asked in their native language, Japanese, prompting questions related to injuries, in the manner developed by Peterson and McCabe (1983). This elicitation technique had previously proved to be effective with Japanese children (Minami, 1990; Minami & McCabe, 1991, 1996). Questions about personally experienced events were asked, such as "Have you ever gotten hurt?" in children's native language, Japanese. However, no specific questions were asked. The narratives elicited from the children were thus without scaffolding[3] and relatively monologic in nature.

To understand language-specific styles of narrative discourse, we need to consider how differently young children and more mature speakers of the same language deploy their language. To examine the relative narrative competence of young children, therefore, narratives were also elicited from adults, the children's mothers in this study. Adult narratives are expected to provide the culturally appropriate, full-fledged, rhetorically well-formed narrative that children will accomplish eventually in telling personal narratives.

Dialogic narrative production. Mothers who participated in this project were supplied with tape recorders and blank cassette tapes. They were asked to elicit interesting past events or experiences from their children in a relaxed and informal situation. In this way, mothers and their children

were audio-tape-recorded in their homes. Recall in the interviewer's narrative elicitation described above, non-directive general cues were given and thus narratives were elicited from the children without providing any scaffolding. In this mother-child conversational activity, on the other hand, mothers were expected to scaffold the narratives of their young children. In this project, therefore, following the methods McCabe and Peterson (1991) used in their studies, mothers are expected to ask their children to relate "stories about personal experiences, about real events that have happened in the past" (p. 226). However, mothers were also instructed to do this narrative elicitation in as natural a way as possible, "like you ordinarily behave when you ask your child to talk about past events" (McCabe & Peterson, 1991, p. 226). In contrast to the adult interviewer's monologic narrative elicitation, therefore, this task is dialogic (or co-constructive) in nature and considered crucial to successful child narratives (Ninio & Snow, 1996).

To establish a comparable data base for monologic and dialogic narrative productions, the initial three narrative productions from each activity were analyzed. A note of caution, however, is that while I tried to analyze only talk about past experiences, talk about past experiences is nonetheless woven in with talk about the present and other non-narrative talk, particularly in mother-child interactions (i.e., dialogic narratives). All narrative (or conversational narrative) segments were transcribed verbatim

for analysis into computer files in accordance with the guidelines of Codes for the Human Analysis of Transcripts (CHAT) conventions for analysis by the Child Language Analysis (CLAN) software available through the Child Language Data Exchange System (CHILDES) (MacWhinney & Snow, 1985, 1990). The Key Word and Line (KWAL) program of CLAN was specifically used to extract linguistic items for further analysis.

Linguistic Items/Narrative Devices

I this section, I primarily use examples told by children. Sometimes, however, I also include adult examples (1) for a comparative purpose[4] or (2) in cases in which no child examples are available.

Two types of interactional particles. Children learn how to convey their ideas to their interlocutors in language. Effective deployment of two interactional particles, (1) the rapport particle ne (you know) and (2) the assertive and/or emphatic particle yo (I tell you, I'm sure), adds sophistication to narratives. The functions of these two particles, however, differ greatly. By uttering the sentence-final particle ne (or nee when elongated), the narrator seeks the listener's agreement mostly in the form of back channels, expresses the narrator's psychological and emotional dependence on the listener, and thus tries to establish narrator-listener rapport or intersubjectivity, which, following Ninio and Snow (1996), means "a state in

which two or more persons share a feeling of 'togetherness'" (p. 23):

Example 1 (Ryota, boy, age 3;8)

Mari chan wa **ne**,

'Mari, you know,'

asoko no kooen de **ne**,

'to that park, you know,'

buranko ittete **ne**,

'(I) went to play a swing, you know,'

doboon tte **ne**,

'with a bang, you know,'

ochita no.

'(I) fell.'

In the above example, ne is frequently used when the narrator provides background information (e.g., either orientation or evaluation or both). Although not shown in the example, the listener (the interviewer in this case), by showing brief vocal acknowledgments (i.e., back channels), signals that he or she is attentive to what the narrator is narrating. Using the interactional particle ne facilitates the process of interpretation based on the assumption that the narrator and the listener share common ground; more important, it suggests that even a monologic narrative is dialogic to some extent.

In contrast to ne, the narrator uses the interactional particle yo only when the narrator assumes that he or she

knows something that the listener does not know. In other words, the narrator is the sole possessor of certain knowledge or information.

Example 2a (Yumi, girl, age 4;4)

demo oborenakatta **yo**.

'But (I) wasn't drowned, I tell you.'

Example 2b (Akira, boy, age 4;6)

konna ookikatta **yo**.

'(That) was this big, I tell you.'

In this way, although the particles ne and yo both illustrate the interactional nature of Japanese language, ne is interaction-focused, whereas yo is information-focused (Maynard, 1993). Thus, these two types of particles function differently and enrich narratives in different ways.

The quotation-final particle tte. The quotation-final particle tte is primarily used for either one of the following two purposes: First, the formation of onomatopoeias is completed by simply adding the quotation-final particle tte (e.g., dokaan tte, which means "with a bang"). Second, reported speech in Japanese is completed by simply adding the quotation-final particle tte at the end (but before the verb itta [said]). Examples 3a and 3b give the formation of onomatopoeia and reported speech, respectively.

Example 3a (Ryota, boy, age 3;8)

sunaba de,

'In a sandbox,'

dokaan **tte**,

'with a bang,'

pataan **tte** ochita.

'with a bang, (I) fell.'

Example 3b (Yumi, girl, age 4;4)

"itai itai" **tte**,

'(It) hurts, (it) hurts,"

naiteta.

'(I) was crying.'

The use of causal connectives. The narrative connective dakara (so, therefore, that's why) almost always appears when the narrator provides the listener with background information. This connective gives a conclusive tone to what the narrator has stated, as can be seen below:

Example 4a (Sho, boy, age 4;6)

dakara kuroi no nutta.

'That's why (I) pained (it) black.'

Example 4b (Sae, girl, age 4;8)

dakara chigau kawa itchatta no.

'That's why (we) went to the wrong river.'

What the narrator has stated should be interpreted by the listener as a sufficient cause/explanation for a result/consequence. In other words, by using dakara, the narrator conveys her personal position, attitude, and, moreover, emotion toward the fact in a very brief way. In adult narratives in particular, the listener who is brought up in the Japanese culture is naturally expected to understand the narrator's strong emotional feelings and easily empathize with the narrator.

Example 4c (Mari's mother)
dakara sobo no kao mo rinkaku mo ussura nan desu kedo.
'That's why (I) have a faint memory of grandmother's face and the contour (of her face), though.'

Like dakara (so, therefore, that's why), datte (but, because), which is another connective, provides the listener with information. Unlike dakara, datte often appears when a child interacts with his or her parents or other adults with whom he or she has established the amae psychological and emotional dependence (and he or she expects omoiyari [empathy] from his or her parents or other intimate adults).[5]

Example 5a (Mari, girl, age 4;0)
datte obachan ga soo itta mon.
'Because someone's mom said so.'

Example 5b (Takato, boy, age 5;1)

datte sonna no wakannai mon.

'Because I didn't know that.'

The use of adverbs. Like the examples of uses of dakara, the adverb yappari (after all) adds the narrator's emotion and attitude toward what he or she has previously narrated. In the following example, yappari refers back to a variety of pastime activities in the neighborhood that an adult narrator has described. In other words, the adverb yappari serves some kind of referential or anaphoric function in narrative.

Example 6 (Minori's mother)

yappari kinjo no minna to asoberu koto ga tanosikute.

'After all it was fun for me to have an opportunity to play with children in the neighborhood.'

Two types of verbs in relation to narrative. Sophistication in adults' narrative, however, is most manifest in the manipulation of "informal/abrupt" verb forms such as the copula da (a linking verb like the English verb "be") and "formal" des(u)/mas(u) verb-ending forms (i.e., suffixes) in Japanese. Note that des(u) is the polite form of da. Examples of these two verb-ending forms are shown below:

Example 7a (Sho, boy, age 4;6)

Sinobu ojisan **da**.

'That's uncle Sinobu.'

Example 7b (Akira, boy, age 4;6)

kore **des** u yo.

'This is the one, I tell you.'

Example 7c (Mari, girl, age 4;0)

sumi**mas**en, nemuri . . .

'(I) am sorry, but I feel sleepy. . .'

Within the inner circle (e.g., mother-child interactions), "informal/abrupt" styles such as da are regularly used, whereas outside the inner circle, in order to maintain personal distance, the "formal" des(u)/mas(u) styles are preferred. When an adult speaker addresses an outsider, he or she uses the "formal" des(u)/mas(u) styles because the outsider is usually placed in a higher position than the speaker; thus, the distinction between des(u)/mas(u) and da is based on complex, culturally specific, elaborated rule systems for social exchange, involving asymmetries of power in some cases. However, there are certainly exceptions, as can be seen in Examples 7b and 7c in which both the children address their mothers using the formal verb-ending forms. These instances seem to indicate that preschool children have already acquired culturally specific politeness routines. At the same time, however, the examples seem to suggest that the social/cultural underpinnings of these markings are so

complex that children use the formal verb-ending forms only in the performance of limited social-communicative acts (i.e., socially routinized set formulas). In other words, while drawing a clear a boundary between children's developing linguistic skills and their developing sociability is certainly difficult, it seems that preschoolers are either simply developing sociability/politeness or packaging the complete communicative event into words in an unanalyzed or unsegmented manner, such as ohayoo gozaimasu (Good morning), asobi mashoo (Let's play), and gochisoosama deshita (Thank you for a nice dish). Thus, regardless of whether they interact with an individual within the inner circle or outside, young children, preschoolers in particular, are likely to use these words in formulaic speech patterns when participating in routinized interactions.

Preschooler's understanding of the distinction between des(u)/mas(u) and da or, more specifically, between "inside" and "outside" is, however, less than complete. In the narrative context, the concept of "inside" and "outside" should be eventually understood as a reflection of a narrator's conceptualization about the narrative event (Maynard, 1993). When a narrator who has access to a certain distant topic tells a narrative about that topic, a triangular relationship emerges among the narrator, the narrative topic, and the listener (Toolan, 1988). That is, as the narrator is increasingly engrossed in the topic, he or she takes more distance from the listener; that is, a shift

occurs from narrative external (i.e., the closer relation between the narrator and the listener rather than the relation between the narrator and the topic) to narrative internal (i.e., the closer relation between the narrator and the topic than the relation between the narrator and the listener). In the case of Japanese, as the narrator's perspective has shifted toward narrative internal, the narrator tells a narrative without using the formal des(u)/mas(u) styles. The narrator, however, at times becomes aware of the existence of the listener and addresses him or her directly; then, he or she takes a narrative-external perspective, using the formal des(u)/mas(u) styles. Thus, the choice of the verb-ending forms suggests the position he or she is taking.

In relation to this perspective taking, one of the classic studies that call our attention to children's language development is Piaget's (1959) pioneering work on young children's developmental constraints. Piaget pointed out that young children are egocentric; they are limited in perspective taking, ignoring the particular angle from which certain things are viewed. The present data--preschoolers use of the formal verb-ending forms only in set formulas, not in narrative-perspective taking--seem to support this limited perspective taking. Control over the rules for taking different points of view in narratives as well as for expressing intentions politely have not yet fully developed during the preschool years. Certainly, preschoolers can

intentionally take on the point of view of people around them, more specifically, a narrative external position. For example, by frequently uttering ne (you know), Japanese preschoolers negotiate with the listener about the stance they are taking. As far as the present data are concerned, however, children have failed to use the formal des(u)/mas(u) styles for representing a narrative-external perspective. As will become clear later, in whichever the context is--monologic or dialogic--preschool children have not yet mastered the effective use of des(u)/mas(u) styles in telling personal narratives. The underpinnings of these des(u)/mas(u) and da markings in terms of perspective-taking seem not only socially but also cognitively too complex for preschoolers. In other words, these narrative devices are beyond children's cognitive and linguistic capability at the preschool level.

Adult narratives stand in contrast to children's narratives with respect to narrative perspective taking. Adults are obviously capable of producing narrative with proper perspectives. Linguistically, as they are increasingly involved in narratives, adults are capable of effectively differentiating between the formal and informal verb-ending forms. In the following narrative example, an adult narrator does not use the formal des(u)/mas(u) styles initially because she is absorbed in the narrative (i.e., her classmate's death). Towards the end, however, she uses the formal des(u)/mas(u) styles because she takes a distance from

the topic, becomes fully aware of the listener, and addresses him or her directly.

Example 8 (Akira's mother)

"umi biraki ga hajimatta hi ni, umi e tobikonde itte, shinzoo mahi de, shinjattan **da**," toka itte.

"on the first day of the season when the sea was open to the public, (he) jumped into the water. Because of heart failure, (he) died" said (a friend of mine).'

sono toki ni hajimete kurai shinutte yuu ninshiki ga, dekita gurai datta, to omoun **desu**.

'At that time first, (I) formed the recognition that (human beings) die, (I) think.'

Results

Uses of Linguistic Items in Monologic Narratives: Differences Between Children and Adults

The data for seven measures--the interactional particle ne (you know), the assertive and/or emphatic particle yo (I tell you), the quotation-final particle tte, the connective dakara (that's why), the adverb yappari (after all), the formal des(u)/mas(u) verb-ending forms, and the copula da--were analyzed.[6]

The mean frequencies of the linguistic items are presented in Table 1. The informal verb-ending style da and the particle yo each appear only twice in children's narratives, and yappari (after all) and des(u)/mas(u) do not

appear at all. Another connective datte (but, because), which, like dakara (so, therefore, that's why), provides the listener with information, appears only once in children's narratives. However, dakara does not appear at all in the children's monologic narratives.

In terms of the use of the interactional/rapport particle ne (you know), no difference reached statistical significance between preschoolers and adults. Comparisons of mean frequencies by t tests, however, revealed that except for ne, children's uses of linguistic items are very limited when telling personal narratives.

Insert Table 1 about here.

What is evident here is that uses of linguistic items--both morphological and lexical--differed significantly between children and adults. In children's monologic narratives, except for the rapport particle ne (you know), they have not yet learned to deploy certain grammatical items (e.g., dakara, which means "so, therefore, that's why" and yappari, which means "after all") that encode evaluation. Conversely, the adult group used the linguistic devices more frequently and effectively than did the preschoolers. In other words, by deploying the linguistic items, the adults succeeded in including more evaluative comments in their narratives.

Children's Uses of Linguistic Items: Differences Between Monologic and Dialogic Narratives

Differences in children's narrative performance in different contexts--monologic and dialogic--were considered next. Table 2 presents the mean frequencies of the linguistic items the children used in the monologic and dialogic narratives. For example, the children used the assertive/emphatic particle yo (I tell you) and the quotation-final particle tte more frequently in mother-child interactions. A connective, dakara (so, therefore), which did not appear at all in monologic narratives, was used by four children. Further, another connective, datte (but, because), which appeared only once in monologic narratives, was used by nine children. Similarly, the formal des(u)/mas(u) styles were used by five children,

Separate two-way analyses of variance (Type of Narrative Interaction X Gender) were carried out for each of the following seven dependent measures: the interactional particle ne (you know), the assertive and/or emphatic particle yo (I tell you), the quotation-final particle tte, the connective dakara (that's why), the connective datte (but, because), the formal des(u)/mas(u) verb-ending forms, and the copula da.[7] Interestingly, in spite of the fact that Japanese is often cited as a language that is particularly rich in words, phrases, and formulations of politeness that only women use (e.g., Shibatani, 1990), there were no significant main effects or interactions associated with

children's gender. Instead, ANOVAs revealed significant effects involving the type of narrative context (monologic or dialogic), in almost all of the linguistic items examined (see Table 2).

Insert Table 2 about here.

Discussion

The linguistic items/devices examined in this paper are necessary for preschool children to learn for the coherency of narrative discourse. While they might have sufficient command to produce grammatically correct sentences, as they grow, preschool children need to continue to improve narrative discourse coherency in order to become capable of encoding emotion in a sophisticated manner. As seen in the uses of the linguistic items in monologic narratives, however, Japanese narrators, regardless of their age, try to communicate by frequently using the interactional/rapport particle ne (you know). This particle probably emerges in early stages of language development and, moreover, comes to be used in the narrative context because of the mother's strong emphasis on a culturally preferred interactional style. That is, Japanese culture is characterized as interdependence, as seen in the reciprocal nature of amae (dependence) and omoiyari (empathy). Because people tend to attach a significant meaning to rapport and empathy in Japanese society, and because children learn amae related

feelings and behaviors through mother-child interactions (Doi, 1973; Lebra, 1976), it is understandable that young children use the rapport particle in their early narrative production.

The study of preschool children's monologic narrative production, however, has revealed that except for ne, they have not yet learned to deploy certain grammatical items (e.g., dakara, which means "so, therefore, that's why" and yappari, which means "after all") that encode background information, evaluation in particular (see Table 1). The differences between adults and preschool children represent, as Berman and Slobin (1994) put it, how "experiences are filtered--(a) through choice of perspective, and (b) through the set of options provided by the particular language--into verbalized events" (p. 611). Thus, although preschool children seem to be developing a sense of their voice and learning how to take audience into account while narrating, they do not seem to have mastered how to manipulate linguistic devices for the best effect.

The linguistic items used by the preschoolers in mother-child interactions exhibit both similarities to and differences from those they used in telling their personal experience on their own. But, in many cases, differences in situation seem to let the same narrator employ different narrative devices. The children frequently used ne in both contexts, but more frequently in mother-child interactions. Likewise, the distributions of other linguistic items in the

dialogic narrative context are strikingly different from those in the monologic narrative context. To understand these differences, we must consider how the contexts of narrative-telling activities affect the narrator's language use. Developmentally, talking about topics related to the past should be within the preschool children's cognitive and linguistic capabilities. Yet the children's more effective employment of a variety of lexical items in dialogic narrative situations than in monologic narrative situations seem to suggest that telling personal narratives alone (i.e., monologic narratives) is much more difficult than co-constructing narratives (i.e., dialogic narratives), in terms of encoding emotion. This is probably because, in telling monologic narratives without any help, young children tend to be preoccupied with sequential recapitulation. In mother-child interactions, in contrast, children collaborate with their mothers in the creation of shared meaning; that is, mothers and children jointly focus on a past event so that mothers can help children include evaluative comments in their narratives, in addition to sequential information. When their abilities are low or primitive, scaffolding is helpful, or even necessary, for them to reach the full potential of their narrative/story telling. As children grow, however, they need decreasing support from the environment around them. In this way, mothers help children to provide enough background information and evaluate the events they are narrating. The results thus seem to indicate

the importance of parents' sensitivity to children's competence.

Obviously, the differences in monologic and dialogic narrative contexts seem to highlight the fact that preschoolers, to some extent, perceive the difference between "inside" and "outside." In order to use formal styles effectively in narrative, children may need to get more accustomed to the transition from home to school, a move from the amae-based inside world to some kind of outside world, where the meaning of life in a group and a social hierarchy are emphasized (Lewis, 1995). Linguistically, moreover, when children need to produce connected discourse autonomously in school settings--telling stories and reading stories in a textbook on their own--their skills in expressing their own state of mind as well as assessing others' state of mind become increasingly important. Telling stories through interactions (with mothers or other sensitive adults who know something about the narrated event) is no longer enough in school settings.

Certainly, the question still remains whether "Due to the development of linguistic devices children come to talk about emotion" or "Because of the need to talk about emotion certain linguistic devices develop." This might be one of those timeless questions, like the chicken or the egg. Who can say which is the cause of which? One thing seems clear, however. Cognitive, linguistic, conversational, and social-interactional dimensions are not necessarily separable, but

rather they are related to each other; social development affects cognitive and linguistic development and vice versa. These factors interact in a complex fashion in narrative development. At the risk of sounding somewhat contradictory, however, they at the same time take different courses in the process of language acquisition, as we have observed in this study. In telling personal narratives--monologic narratives in particular--preschoolers have not yet mastered certain linguistic devices and manipulative strategies that encode the narrator's perspective as well as emotion. Overall, therefore, unlike talking about the here-and-now, in the development of narrative skills preschoolers have a long way to go. Narrative-telling activities are a place that provides children with an opportunity to develop interactionally, socioculturally, and cognitively in increasingly sophisticated ways. But it is much later in the course of development that they can become fully adept at expressing their communicative intents, emotion in particular. As Reilly (1992) suggests, we might in fact need to wait for children to become ten or eleven years old in order to be able to integrate emotion in their narratives in an affectively interesting and engaging way. As we observed in this study, preschool children's narrative skills are rudimentary and inefficient in terms of encoding emotion; they have not yet mastered the full array of means for expressing their emotion with optimal effectiveness in their narratives. Their narrative skills need to undergo

considerable expansion and refinement to reach the level of proficiency exhibited by adults. It thus seems that children gradually become capable of using narrative devices that have a fully array of means for expressing emotion. Telling a narrative on their own does not seem to be an easy task for young children; a considerable time span is needed to reach the adult level of proficiency.

References

Berman, R. A., & Slobin, D. I. (1994). Relating events in narrative: A crosslinguistic developmental study. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bruner, J. (1977). Early social interaction and language development. In H. R. Schaffer (Ed.), Studies in mother-child interaction (pp. 271-289). London: Academic Press.

Bruner, J. (1986). Actual minds, possible worlds. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Clancy, P. M. (1985). The acquisition of Japanese. In D. I. Slobin (Ed.), The crosslinguistic study of language acquisition, Volume 1: The Data (pp. 373-524). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Doi, T. (1973). The anatomy of dependence (J. Bester, Trans). Tokyo: Kodansha International. (Original work published 1971)

Feldman, C. F., Bruner, J., Renderer, B., & Spitzer, S. (1990). Narrative comprehension. In B. K. Britton & A. D. Pellegrini (Eds.), Narrative thought and narrative language (pp. 1-78). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hopper, P. (1979). Some observations on the typology of focus and aspect in narrative language. Studies in Language, 3, 37-64.

Labov, W. (1972). Language in the inner city. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lebra, T. S. (1976). Japanese patterns of behavior. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Lewis, C. (1995). Educating hearts and minds: Reflections on Japanese preschool and elementary education. New York: Cambridge University Press.

LoCastro, V. (1987). Aizuchi: A Japanese conversational routine. In L. E. Smith (ed.), Discourse across cultures (PP. 101-113). New York: Prentice Hall.

MacWhinney, B., & Snow, C. E. (1985). The Child Language Data Exchange System. Child Language, 12, 271-296.

MacWhinney, B., & Snow, C. E. (1990). The Child Language Data Exchange System: An update. Child Language, 17, 457-472.

Maynard, S. K. (1989). Japanese conversation: Self-contextualization through structure and interactional management. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Maynard, S. K. (1993). Discourse modality: Subjectivity, emotion and voice in the Japanese language. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.

McCabe, A., & Peterson, C. (1991). Getting the story: Parental styles of narrative elicitation and developing narrative skills. In A. McCabe & C. Peterson (Eds.), Developing narrative structure (pp. 217-253). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Minami, M. (1990). Children's Narrative Structure: How Do Japanese Children Talk about Their Own Stories.

Unpublished qualifying paper, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, MA.

Minami, M. (1996). Japanese children's personal narratives. First Language, 16, 339-363.

Minami, M., & McCabe, A. (1991). Haiku as a discourse regulation device: Stanza analysis of Japanese children's personal narratives. Language in Society, 20, 577-599.

Minami, M., & McCabe, A. (1996). Compressed collections of experiences. In A. McCabe (Ed.), Chameleon readers: Some problems cultural differences in narrative structure pose for multicultural literacy programs (pp. 72-97). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ninio, A., & Snow, C. E. (1996).Pragmatic development. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Peterson, C., & McCabe, A. (1983). Developmental psycholinguistics: Three ways of looking at a child's narrative. New York: Plenum.

Piaget, J. (1959). The language and thought of the child. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Reilly, J. S. (1992). How to tell a good story: The intersection of language and affect in children's narratives. Journal of Narrative and Life History, 2, 355-377.

Sachs, J. (1979). Topic selection in parent-child discourse. Discourse Processes, 2, 145-153.

Shibatani, M. (1990). The languages of Japan. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Toolan, M. J. (1988). Narrative: A critical linguistic introduction. London: Routledge.

White, S. (1989). Back-channels across cultures: A study of Americans and Japanese. Language in Society, 18, 59-76.

Yamada, H. (1992). American and Japanese business discourse: A comparison of interactional styles. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Footnotes

1. According to Labov's (1972) original definition, because a narrative includes at least two sequentially ordered events, complicating actions are the only obligatory component of the narrative. This is why foreground information, which roughly corresponds to complicating actions, is called the skeletal structure of the narrative.

2. Although differences between the children in four-year-old classrooms and the children in the five-year-old classrooms were initially examined, no age differences were identified. In this paper, therefore, age differences in the preschoolers are not discussed.

3. Note that scaffolding, which will be discussed more extensively later in the discussion section, means the temporary help that adults give children to perform a task (Bruner, 1977).

4. As I previously stated, for the writing of this paper I was greatly inspired by Maynard's (1993) study on emotion. I would like to note, however, that I chose certain linguistic devices and strategies because of my intuitive notion of their importance in narrative and/or because of their prominence in the literature.

5. Following leading Japanese psychiatrist Takeo Doi (1973), there is a reciprocal relationship between amae and omoiyari; amae means the state of dependency on the indulgence or benevolence of another person, and omoiyari, an aspect describing consideration for others.

6. Note that the connective datte (because) is not included for this analysis because it is primarily used when interacting with family members.

7. Since children used yappari in neither context--monologic or dialogic--the adverb was not included for the analyses.

Table 1

Uses of Linguistic Items in Monologic narratives:

Differences Between Children and Adults

	Children (n = 20) Mean	(SD)	Mothers (n = 20) Mean	(SD)	t[a] values
Particles					
ne	7.75	(6.69)	9.90	(6.46)	1.03
yo	0.10	(0.31)	2.90	(2.85)	4.38***
ne	0.85	(1.35)	8.00	(5.34)	5.81***
Connectives					
dakara	0.00	(0.00)	1.45	(1.73)	3.75**
Adverb					
sugoku	0.00	(0.00)	1.35	(2.01)	3.01*
Verbs					
des(u)/mas(u)	0.00	(0.00)	13.50	(8.24]	7.33***
da	0.10	(0.45)	3.00	(2.29)	5.55***

*p < 0.01
**p < 0.001
***p < 0.0001

[a] Degrees of freedom = 38

Table 2

Children's Uses of Linguistic Items: Differences Between Monologic and Dialogic Narratives

	Monologic				Dialogic				F^avalues for
	Male		Female		Male		Female		main effect of
	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	CONTEXT
Particles									
ne	8.10	(5.71)	7.40	(7.85)	15.90	(21.76)	25.30	(20.55)	6.67*
yo	0.10	(0.32)	0.10	(0.32)	2.10	(3.04)	2.10	(2.47)	10.32**
tte	0.90	(1.45)	0.80	(1.32)	5.10	(5.17)	7.30	(7.54)	13.09***
Connectives									
dakara	0.00	(0.00)	0.00	(0.00)	0.20	(0.63)	1.00	(2.49)	2.17*
datte	0.10	(0.32)	0.00	(0.00)	0.50	(0.71)	0.80	(0.92)	9.97**
Verbs									
des(u)/mas(u)	0.00	(0.00)	0.00	(0.00)	0.20	(0.42)	0.30	(0.48)	6.08
da	0.20	(0.63)	0.00	(0.00)	1.80	(3.05)	2.30	(3.62)	6.67*

*p < 0.02
**p < 0.01
***p < 0.001

[a] Degrees of freedom = 1, 36